



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/064,892

08/27/2002

Thomas M. Breuel

111744

3616

27074

7590

07/12/2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.

P.O. BOX 19928

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/12/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com

jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/064,892	Applicant(s) BREUEL ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13,16 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-13, 16, and 18-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration filed on 4/18/2007.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1, 3-13, 16, and 18-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, and 16 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1, 3-16, and 18-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Formanek et al, hereinafter Formanek (USPub.# 2003/0014445, 1/16/2003, filed 7/13/01, as disclosed in IDS filed on 9/24/03), in view of Microsoft Paint XP, 2001, "Save As" screendumps, Microsoft Windows XP Professional, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), and based on U.S provisional application # 60/360,171 filed on 3/1/2002, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 8/27/2002 have been approved by the Examiner.

Response To Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.131

6. The Affidavit filed on 4/18/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered, and has overcome the effective filing date of the Formanek (USPub.# 2003/0014445, 1/16/2003, filed 7/13/01, as disclosed in IDS filed on 9/24/03) reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuli, hereinafter Formanek (USPat.# 6633314, 10/14/2003, filed 2/16/2000).

Regarding independent claim 1, Tuli discloses decomposing, and processing a document image into several sections, which are then compressed—*deconstructing a document in a page image format, synthesizing the deconstructed document into an intermediate data structure --* (col.2, lines 56-64).

Furthermore, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the display of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device, such as a palm phone device—*distilling the intermediate data structure for redisplay by converting the intermediate data structure into a format usable for an arbitrarily sized display structure, wherein the intermediate data structure is automatically adaptable at the time of display to constraints of any display device or circumstance of viewing* (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Tuli discloses decomposing, and processing a document image into several sections, which are then compressed—*physical segmentation of data* -- (col.2, lines 56-64).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses decomposing, and processing a document image into several sections (col.2, lines 56-64).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses translating, decomposing, and processing a document image into several sections, which are then compressed— *converting non-text image areas, Layout properties and segmented image areas into the intermediate data structure* -- (col.2, lines 56-64).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the display of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen

Art Unit: 2178

of display device, such as a palm phone device —*intelligible display layout* -- (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Tuli discloses decomposing, and processing a document, which contains text, image, normally displayed into a single web page, into several sections arranged in a reading or priority order (col.2, lines 35-64).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses a computer decomposing, and processing a document image into several sections (col.2, lines 56-64).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the redisplay of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device, such as a palm phone device (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the redisplay of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device over the Internet, —*Internet browsable format* --such as a palm phone device (col.3, lines 1-30, fig. 1-2).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the redisplay of the image sections in a priority order to fit the

Art Unit: 2178

screen of display device, such as a palm phone device —*device specific display format* -- (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the redisplay of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device, such as a palm phone device — *screen size* -- (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 1, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the redisplay of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device, such as a palm phone device (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 16, limitations *an input/output device... ..a distilling circuit...* are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Moreover, Tuli discloses decomposing, and processing a document image, which would normally be displayed as a single html document, into several sections, which are then compressed— *deconstruct the document into image areas, and segmented image elements, synthesizes the non-text image areas, the layout properties, and the set of segmented image elements into an intermediate data structure*-- (col.2, lines 35-64, fig.2). In other words, the image is divided up into sections preserving the layout of the text and image objects.

Furthermore, Tuli discloses the decompression of the image received by a user, and the display of the image sections in a priority order to fit the screen of display device, such as a palm phone device—*distilling the intermediate data structure for redisplay in a format usable for an arbitrarily sized display structure* -- (col.3, lines 1-16, fig. 2).

Claims 18-20, and 22-25 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 3, 6-7, and 10-13 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 16, Tuli discloses decomposing—*deconstructed document*--, and processing a document image, which would normally be displayed as a single html document, into several sections, which are then compressed --- (col.2, lines 35-64, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 26, Tuli teaches decomposing—*segmentation algorithm* --, and processing a document image, which would normally be displayed as a single html document, into several sections, which are then compressed. A translator converts part of the image associated with hyperlinks into bold—*background structure analyzer*- (col.2, lines 35-64, col. 3, lines 23-30 fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/18/2007 have been fully considered , and they are persuasive. The Applicants submit that Formanek does not qualify as a prior art reference in view of the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration filed herewith (page 7). As indicated above, the declaration establishes the reduction to practice of the claimed invention. Therefore, a new rejection in light of the newly found prior art reference, for rejecting the claims has been included above.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jakubowski (Pat. # 2002/0143821 A1), and Saito et al. (Pat. # 6,208,426 B1).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR


Art Unit: 2178

system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571 272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/3/2007